The Lew Offices



1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

5

in in

16.11

18

19

21

23

24

25

TIME: 241pm

SUPPLIES OF THE SUPPLIES OF TH

Office of the Attorney General

Leonardo M. Rapadas Attorney General of Guam

Civil Division

287 West O'Brien Drive

Hagåtña, Guam 96910 ● USA

(671) 475-3324 (Telephone) ◆ (6~1) 472-2493 (Facsimile) www.guamattorneygeneral.com

Dane 10:21AM

Time 10:21AM

3 2-13-224

Attorneys for the Government of Guam

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM HAGATNA, GUAM

MARIA A. GANGE, JESUS CRUZ
CHARFAUROS, ANA A. CHARGUALAF,
JESUS G. AGUIGUI, for themselves and on
behalf of all others similarly situated.

Plaintiffs.

VS.

GOVERNMENT OF GUAM, GUAM ANCESTRAL LANDS COMMISSION by and through its individual Commissioners (for injunctive relief only to prevent a transfer) and DOES One (1) through Three hundred (300), inclusive.

Defendants,

) CIVIL CASE NO. CV1461-10

GOVERNMENT'S POSITION ON THE 1SSUES THE COURT ORDERED BRIEFED ON NOVEMBER 30, 2012

The Government's position on the issues the Court ordered briefed on November

30, 2012, are as follows:

0224

Page 1 Government's Position on Issues the Coart Ordered Briefed on November 30-2012 Civil Case No. CV1461-10 THE VANDEVELD LAW OFFICES, P.C. RECEIVED

TE: 2/1/13 TIME: 0 30 BY: 5

0.00th wer for

Issue #1: Whether this is a takings case.

The Government's position is that this is not a takings case, since the land in question, or the potential profits therefrom, are not private property. The government has briefed this issue in its September 8, 2010 Motion to Dismiss and in its April 30, 2012 Opposition to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, relying primarily upon the reasoning of the case A.B.A.T.E. of Illinois, Inc. v. Giannoulias, Treasurer, State of Illinois, et al., 2010 WL 2222801 (Ill.App.4Dist. 2010). The government respectfully incorporates that briefing herein. The government has nothing to add to its prior briefing on this issue at this time.

Issue #2: Whether if this is a takings case, the taking qualifies as being for a legitimate public purpose.

If the Court rules that the property involved is indeed the private property of the patrice plaintiff class, and that this indeed is therefore a takings case, then it is the povernment's position that the taking does not qualify as being for a public purpose, and therefore must be enjoined. That is because if this is a takings case, then it is a taking from one private property owner, or from one class of private property owners, for the purpose of giving that property to another private property owner, or group of private property owners, for their personal, private benefit; as opposed to being for the benefit of the wider public generally. Even under the U.S. Supreme Court's arguably expanded definition of "public purpose" in *Kelo v. Cuy of New London*, 545 U.S. 469 (2005), this would not qualify as one.

2 2 2

Issue #3: If this is a takings case, then what would constitute just compensation to the plaintiff class?

If the Court rules that this is indeed a takings case, and that the taking does indeed serve a legitimate "public purpose," then it is the government's position that the taking should be enjoined.

In that event, the taking will not happen, and no compensation will have to be paid. It plainly was not the legislature's intention to take the private property of anyone in this case. If the legislature had so intended, the legislature would have made plans to pay the tens (at a minimum) of millions of dollars of just compensation that would be required. It never having been the intent of the Legislature to do a "taking," and to pay the just compensation that would be required if this were a "taking," then Public Law 30-158 should simply be enjoined if the Court decides that it does indeed constitute a taking.

Respectfully submitted this $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}_{f}$

OFFICE OF THE ALLORNEY GENERAL

LEONARDO M. RAPADAS, Attorney General

Bv:

WILLIAM C. BISCHOFF

Assistant Attorney General

Attorneys for the Government of Guam